



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## NOTES ON THE ROMAN PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN<sup>1</sup>

It is a pleasure greater than I can express to speak to this notable gathering of teachers on the subject of the pronunciation of Latin. Correct pronunciation is by no means the most important thing in the study of the literature. But it is *an* important thing; and I believe it also to be an economical thing, if the learning of it is attacked at the right time. The main tenets of my paper are, first, that a person who is taught to read prose rightly will read poetry with very little difficulty, and in so doing will be saved a great waste of time, in addition to getting a genuine pleasure out of the operation; and, second, that it only requires a little additional pains on the part of the teacher (after he has once formed his own habits) to make correct pronunciation of prose on the part of the pupil possible. The pains must be taken, however, not when the student begins Virgil, but when he begins to learn his first Latin forms or read his first Latin sentences in the "Beginner's Book."

The title of my paper, as first announced ("The Roman Pronunciation of Latin"), is somewhat misleading. I ought to have called it "The Roman Pronunciation of Latin, exclusive of any questions with regard to the qualities of the sounds."

It may strike you at first that this limitation excludes the whole subject. In point of fact, however, more than half of it is reserved. To put the matter in another way, while we have had one reform of the Roman pronunciation, I believe that we have not half done the work, but seriously need to reform, or rather to form for the first time, the reformed pronunciation.

<sup>1</sup> The following paper was prepared by Professor WILLIAM GARDNER HALE, to be read at the Classical Conference (see page 430). In place of making use of it, however, Professor Hale addressed himself informally to eight pupils from the Ann Arbor High School, engaged for the purpose through the kindness of Principal Pattengill and the Misses Porter and Breed, teachers of Latin in the school. Three of the eight pupils were in the first year of the school and five in the second. None of them, accordingly, had any knowledge of Latin meters. Professor Hale had them pronounce and inflect a number of individual words in the spirit of the proposals of the paper, then words in sentences, and, finally, without warning, hexameter verses from Virgil.

Let me now build up my views, point after point, without disclosing at once my aims. What I have to say will fall under three general heads—words in isolation, words in combination in prose, words in combination in poetry.

#### I. THE ISOLATED WORD

The ancient Roman grammarians tell us that a long vowel was twice as long as a short vowel. That, of course, is only an approximate and rough measure, but probably no better one for practical purposes could have been given. We may illustrate by saying that the long vowel in the termination *-ānus* (as in *Rōmānus*) is twice as long as the short vowel in the word *anus* "old woman." Or, to represent the matter to the eye, we may write the *a* twice, as the Romans for some time did write several of their long vowels, and may give to each of these two vowels the short mark, thus:

ă-nūs  
ăă-nūs

Now, if the long syllable *a* in *ăănus* was, roughly speaking, twice as long as the short syllable *a* in *anus*, then in such a word as *annus* the first *n* must have taken as much time as the short vowel; for this *n* corresponds to the second short vowel in the word *ăă-nus*. The consonant *n*, coming before another consonant, and being pronounced (as it was by the Romans) with a full and clear utterance, took as much time to pronounce as a short vowel. We may set this down graphically in a form similar to the one used above:

-ăă-nus  
ăă-nus

But what of the second *n* in *annus*, or of the single *n* in *anus*? Undoubtedly it took a certain amount of time to pronounce. Still, the consonantal contact in passing from one vowel position to another is brief, and, being distinctly less than the time occupied in the pronunciation of the vowel, does not add appreciably to the length of the syllable.

We have accordingly reached two statements: (1) A single consonant between two vowels takes no appreciable time in pronunciation. (2) A consonant obstructed in pronunciation by coming before the repetition of itself takes as much time to pronounce as a short vowel.

But when we turn to Roman poetry we find that, in addition to

syllables containing long vowels, and syllables containing a short vowel plus a consonant immediately repeated, there is a large class of long syllables of another kind, containing a short vowel which is followed by two consonants that are *not* alike. What must be the case here? We have only to write examples upon the board to see the inevitable conclusion. If in *fuisse*, *e. g.*, the first *s* occupies as much time in pronunciation as the short vowel *i*, then in *ipse*, *e. g.*, the *p* must likewise occupy as much time in pronunciation as the short vowel *i*. This may be represented graphically as follows:

fū-īš-sě  
īp-sě

The same, of course, is the case in many combinations, as in the following words, which are taken from the early part of Book I of the *Æneid*: Op-tes, fac-to, om-nes, un-de, ves-tri.

Only one class of syllables appears in which the case seems to be different, namely, those in which the vowel is followed by a combination like *tr* or *pr*, as in *patres*, *apri*, etc.,—the combination known as mute and liquid. The nature of these combinations is such that the second consonant follows the other trippingly, the two being uttered in rapid succession in the passage from one vowel position to another, and with no appreciable addition to the time spent in pronouncing the vowels; unless, indeed, the poet *desired* length, in which case he must clearly have pronounced the first consonant in a sort of separation from the second, as if it were really an obstructed consonant. These two possibilities may be represented as follows:

pă-trēs (ordinarily)  
păt-rēs (occasionally)

We may now, on the evidence of poetry and of the ancient grammarians, generalize as follows:

(1) The unit of length is a short vowel, or an obstructed consonant.

(2) A syllable containing a long vowel or diphthong, or a short vowel plus an obstructed consonant, is long.<sup>1</sup>

(3) Every consonant preceding another consonant was, in the

<sup>1</sup> If a syllable is made up of a long vowel plus an obstructed consonant, like the first syllable in *āc-tus*, it was of course still longer in ordinary speech. In verse it was doubtless compressed a little, so that, while the vowel continued to sound long, rather than short, the syllable as a whole occupied only the time belonging to that part of the foot in which it stood.

clear utterance of the Romans, an obstructed consonant, excepting only a mute followed by a liquid; and even the mute might, if the poet desired, be pronounced as if it were obstructed, being separated from the liquid and clearly pronounced in the same impulse with the preceding vowel.

This conclusion with regard to obstructed consonants and their actual effect in Roman speech follows so absolutely from the undoubted facts of poetical usage that it would require a heavy weight of evidence to overthrow it. Yet it is thus far the belief of very few people. The traditional doctrine is as follows: In the division of syllables, as many consonants go with the following vowel as can be put at the beginning of a word, either in Latin or in Greek; that is, *optes* is pronounced not *op-tes*, as I have given it above, but *o-ptes*, *omnis* not *om-nis*, but *o-mnis*, etc. I must recapitulate very briefly the arguments used to support this position,<sup>1</sup> and my rebuttal of them.<sup>2</sup> The arguments for it are as follows:

(1) The ancient Roman grammarians make the statement given above with regard to the division of syllables. (2) The pronunciation of the modern languages descended from Latin agrees with the statement of the ancient grammarians. Sturm reports that the Italians, for example, pronounce *ba-sta*, *fre-sco*, *ca-pi-sco*, etc. (3) A few Latin inscriptions have points between syllables, as well as between words, and, though the usage varies, the evidence supports the statements of the grammarians.

My answer is as follows:

(1) The Roman grammarians made no such statement before the eighth century. The first and only man who says that you should so divide in writing *or speaking*, "*cum scribis aut dicis*," is the venerable Bede, an Englishman born in 674. Before his time such a phrase as *aut dicis* never occurs.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, again and again it is

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps best stated in Lindsay's *The Latin Language*, p. 125.

<sup>2</sup> My discussion, with references also to the position of others, will be found in the volume of the Harvard Studies in Classical Philology dedicated by former pupils to Professor Lane (Vol. VII). I shall before long publish the arguments in a fuller form, with additional data from inscriptions, and new data from manuscripts.

<sup>3</sup> Only one single word in any earlier writer, namely the word *sonorius*, which is given by Priscian as a translation from Herodian, has any suggestion of reference to speech. So far as it goes, this word makes in favor of the other side. The probable explanation of its occurrence is suggested, I think, by what is said under the next head.

clearly shown that it is division in *writing* alone that is thought of. The phrases used are, for example, "quae consonantes in *scribendo* sibi cohaereant," "in *scriptura*," "si maiestas *scribis*," "sequenti syllabae dare in *scribendo*." It is perfectly evident that the grammarians are thinking only of a convenient rule of division where, in writing, a part of a word must be carried over the line. (2) I am forced to believe that the phonetists have deceived themselves with regard to syllabification in the Romance languages. To my ear, the Italians, for instance, when speaking without consciousness on this point, say *bas-ta*, *fres-co*, *capi-s-co*, etc., not *ba-sta*, *fre-sco*, *capi-sco*. Two years ago, while residing in Rome, I tested the pronunciation of something like twenty-five people in this regard. All pronounced, in the first instance, as I have said. In all but a few cases, however, *when I told my interlocutor what I desired to know*, and *then* asked him how he divided the words, he said, without hesitation, *ba-sta*, *fre-sco*, etc.; and when I asked why he so pronounced, answered either "because the rule is so," or "because that is the division in writing." In nearly every case, too, he believed that his actual speech conformed to this pronunciation. Thus, if I am not wrong, we have the curious phenomenon of a domination of modern Italian theory by the theory of the ancient Roman grammarians, in the face of the actual facts for both Latin and Italian. (3) The evidence from the division between syllables in inscriptions is not at all what Seelmann, who first called attention to it, supposed it to be. Seelmann's own examples, which he seems not to have counted, show, at the most, four cases for the received theory, and ten against it. Further, his list is a mere chance collection, covering but a small part of the extant examples. I have made a larger count than his, to which I mean later to add. There is no question what the general result will be. The number of examples which I at present have at command is forty-eight against the received theory to nine in favor of it. (4) The evidence from the actual division of words between lines in inscriptions, collected by Dr. Walter Dennison of the University of Michigan (at the time a member of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome), to complete the evidence which I was getting together from other sources, is strongly against the received doctrine. (5) The evidence of manuscripts, which I am collecting, is likewise heavily against the received doctrine. The Roman scribes, of the time of the grammarians themselves, divided, not *fa-cto*, but *fac-to*, not *o-mnes*, but *om-nes*. I have already the

evidence of ten of the earliest manuscripts, dating from the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, and it is overwhelmingly against the doctrine of the Roman grammarians.

There is only one possible conclusion to be drawn from these facts, namely, that the Romans not only did not actually divide in speech in the fashion in which their professors, following the doctrine of the Greek grammarians,<sup>1</sup> told them to divide, but did not even so divide in writing.

An interesting corroboration of this rebuttal is to be seen in one of the very grammarians who are cited in support of the doctrine. Priscian, a grammarian of the fifth century, in his book upon the "Scanning of Twelve Verses of the *Æneid*," touches in three cases upon combinations involving our principles. His division is as follows:

Conticu ere om nes in tenti que ora te nebant.  
 Turnus ut infrac tos ad verso Marte La tinos.  
 Ut bel li si gnum Lau renti Turnus ab arce.

In two of these three cases then, he himself unconsciously decides against his own doctrine. With regard to the third, it should be said that the pronunciation of the combination *gn* is not yet settled. Many believe that it had the sound of *ngn* as in "sing now;" and, if this is true, it would be natural that the *g* should not be separated from the consonant in connection with which it possesses the peculiar sound. In the *majority* of cases in manuscripts, however, I have found that the *g* is separated from the *n*.

We have established our theory. Now for practice.

Our ears are too easily satisfied. In order to make sure that we

<sup>1</sup> The few who have questioned or rejected the syllabification which they have supposed to be laid down by the Roman grammarians have generally assumed that these grammarians had actual Roman speech in mind, and that the cause of their error was a blind following of their predecessors the Greek grammarians, *who were describing the actual pronunciation of their own language*. (So Mommsen, in the *Abh. d. Berl. Akademie*, 1868, p. 163 *seq.* So also, apparently, Professor Bennett, in his Appendix, p. 31; though in the Grammar, § 4, 3, he gives, without suggestion of doubt, the accepted rule). My own view is that the whole of the traditional doctrine originated in a convenient rule devised by some Greek grammarian for dividing words *in writing*; that, in all probability, the Greek writers on the subject, whom the Romans followed, were not thinking of anything but writing; and that, of a certainty, this is true of the mass of the Roman grammarians, down to the seventh century,—a period so late that its testimony is of no weight whatever.

are doing what we wish to do, let us beat time with a pencil, giving two taps to a long vowel, and one to a short vowel, thus

fāmă<sup>1</sup> (two taps to fā, and one to mă).

To fix the contrast between the long and the short sound more clearly, let us give the same word a number of times in succession (continuing to tap), making no stops whatever between.

fāmă fāmă fāmă fāmă fāmă fāmă.

Thus far we are on easy ground. But now let us pronounce an iamb. We strike here our extreme of difficulty. There is nothing in Latin harder to pronounce than a little word made up of an accented short syllable followed by a long. Let us, then, secure ourselves against too easy self-satisfaction by tapping out the time, thus

á-vōs á-mō mé-ōs.

In pronouncing the iamb, we must be sure to keep the accent upon the first syllable. This syllable should be struck sharply and immediately left. The second should be held tranquilly, *without stress*, to its full length.<sup>2</sup> Our ordinary pronunciation practically makes the two syllables of the same length.

Let us now inflect amō in the present indicative, with careful quantities, made sure by tapping :

amō	amāmus
amās	amātis
amat	amant

Here, again, the actual quantities are very unlike those of our ordinary pronunciation. In that pronunciation, the three syllables of amamus receive each about the same time ; and, further, the six forms are pronounced with a monotonous movement which gives about the same time to each, namely two beats.

Especial care must be taken with the third person singular, which contains two short syllables. Let us say the word again and again (amat amat amat amat amat), giving one beat for each syllable, and being sure not to stop between the words. The third person plural also

<sup>1</sup> The common practice is to make all final *a*'s long. The effect to the Roman ear would be as if we were to pronounce Cubā, Havanā, Californiā, etc.

<sup>2</sup> It is difficult to convey the idea of this rhythm, except through actual pronunciation. The student may catch it, however, by reading the following, with a dwelling upon the comparatively long vowel in the word "home;" *don't* say *tó* home, but *át* home." He must be careful, however, not to lengthen the preposition in the least, nor to make the least pause after it.



presents a serious difficulty. In it, the second *a* should be no longer than the first *a*. It is the *obstructed n* which takes time. Let us give one beat, then, to the first *a*, one to the second *a*, and one to the *n*; and, to make sure that we actually do what we are trying to do, let us say the word again and again, with the measured tapping and no pause. Now let us give the principal parts of the same verb, not as they are ordinarily given, in a sing-song manner, with practically the same length for every syllable, whether long or short, but with carefully measured lengths.

Next let us pass to the imperfect indicative active. Here we get on easily until we come to the plural. Then we tend to say *amabāmus*, with the second syllable short, in spite of our repeated assertions that *a* is long in the increment of the verb. Again let us secure ourselves by tapping out the quantity, — one beat to the first syllable, two to the second, two to the third, and one to the fourth. And let us also be upon our guard against putting an *accent* on the long syllable before the accented syllable. We must not say *amábāmus*, but *amābāmus*, striking the second syllable *immediately after* the tap upon the first syllable, and holding it through its full length, but tranquilly and without stress.<sup>1</sup> The student who has learned to do this, and has also learned to pronounce an iamb, can do anything in Latin.

The passive of the imperfect indicative gives us an opportunity to practice this combination throughout the forms, after we have passed the first person singular.

Suppose now our verb has a long first syllable, as for instance *cēlō* has. We are again under temptation to shorten everything until we get to the accent. Let us meet this modern habit by tapping out the time, as for example in *cēlābam*, *cēlābās*, *cēlābat*, *cēlābāmus*, *cēlābātis*, *cēlābant*. In the same way let us give the principal parts, with full and tranquil utterance of the unaccented syllables: *cēlō*, *cēlāre*, *cēlāvī*, *cēlātum*.

Such a pronunciation seems at first strange, but it is absolutely certain that the Romans practiced it. It is not by our own habits of speech that Roman speech must be gauged, but by the actual facts of Roman poetry. Interestingly enough, we do find the early comic poets at times shortening a long syllable after a short one, either just

<sup>1</sup>The rhythm may perhaps be caught through a lengthened pronunciation of "low" and the first syllable of "moaning" (with no *stress* upon "low") in "a low moaning."

before the accent or just after it; but this tendency obviously was checked, for we find nothing of it in classical poetry. We may then safely lay down the proposition, in view of this great difference between the two languages, that, if the rhythm of a given passage sounds natural to us, it would have sounded very strange to Cicero.

Now let us take somewhat longer verbs, for example, *fatīgo* and *dubitō*. The principal parts of *fatīgo* are regularly given as *fatīgō*, *fatīgāre*, *fatīgāvī*, *fatīgātum*. We *know* that they must have sounded like *fatīgo*, *fatīgāre*, *fatīgāvi*, *fatīgātum*. Similarly, if you ask your student to give the future active participle of *dubitō* he is sure to give it as *dubitātūrus*, whereas we know that the *a* was long. Let us then ourselves call the word *dubitātūrus*, and let us hold the rein upon our lawless impulses by continuing to tap out the time.

Next let us turn to the declensions, taking *rēx* for an example. Let us not give the same time to every form, no matter how many syllables it has nor whether these are long or short, but tap them out. We shall then find that the ablative plural, for example, is not made up of three short sounds, as we actually pronounce it, but of a long sound and two short ones, the long one taking up as much time as the two short ones together. Similarly let us decline *rēgīna*, pronouncing, for example, *rēgīnārum* with every syllable held steadily long except the last, but being careful at the same time to *accent* only a single syllable.

## II. WORDS IN COMBINATION IN PROSE.

Where a consonant at the end of a word is obstructed by a consonant at the beginning of the next word, the syllable to which the former one belongs is long, being made up of the short vowel sound plus the consonant sound. So, for example, in *at̄ tamen*, *neq̄ tamen*, *at̄ tamen omnēs*, *at̄ tamen nēmō*, *restant̄ tamen multa*, *ire tamen restat*. A consonant before an initial vowel takes no appreciable additional time to pronounce.

When, on the other hand, a *vowel* at the end of a word is followed by a vowel at the beginning of a word, what happened in daily speech?

1. The antecedent probability is immensely strong that the vowel sounds were run together, that is that the first was slurred into the second. This is habitually the case in Roman poetry. But it is inconceivable that the ordinary poetical form of any nation should be founded

upon a wholly artificial habit. No poetical literature can be shown, in any existing language, that involves a complete upsetting of ordinary speech. If, then, we had no other evidence than that which is afforded by their poetry, I should suppose that the Romans slurred in daily speech.

2. In the *Orator* of Cicero, XLIV, 149-153, and in Quintilian IX, 433-437, there is a considerable and somewhat tangled discussion of slurring and hiatus. In the course of Cicero's discussion these words occur: *quod quidem Latina lingua sic observat, nemo ut tam rusticus sit qui vocalis nolit coniungere*. *Coniungere* is shown by what has preceded ("extremorum verborum cum insequentibus primis concurrere") to mean "slur." Now the *qui* of our editions is an emendation accepted almost universally in place of the *quin* of the manuscripts. It is obvious that *quin* would give just the opposite meaning to the passage. All the context, however, as well as the passage from Quintilian, precludes any such statement as *quin nolit*, and leaves no doubt, in my mind, that Cicero meant to say that in Italy everybody slurred his vowels.

3. But, even if we did not possess this evidence, there remains other evidence which in itself alone would be sufficient. The Romans themselves point out that their orators and prose writers occasionally fell into verse. Quintilian, for example, says that Livy opens his history with the movement of the hexameter. Livy's words are "*Fac-turusne operae pretium sum.*" Now there is no hexameter here, if the *-ne* and the *operae* are pronounced separately. Other instances of the same kind could be adduced.

It seems to me to follow with absolute certainty that the Romans slurred in daily speech; from which it follows that we ought to slur in our ordinary reading, except (as occasionally in poetry), where there might naturally be a strong rhetorical pause. We ought not to form *two* contradictory habits of pronunciation.<sup>1</sup>

### III. WORDS IN COMBINATION IN POETRY.

So much for words in isolation, and words in combination with other words in prose. What now about poetry?

<sup>1</sup> During the sitting of the Latin Conference, under the charge of the Committee of Ten, I proposed this same view, and it was afterwards discussed by correspondence. I desired at that time to make a statement in our report similar to the statement above made. A large majority of the conference agreed with me, but the majority yielded, for the sake of harmony, to the minority.

One would certainly expect that, in Latin as in English, poetry would take care of itself. One reads poetry with a little more measured movement than prose, but otherwise in the same way. If you write a poem with correct movement and print it as continuous prose in a newspaper, the man who reads it, if he has any sense for rhythm at all, is sure to feel the movement, and to recognize what you have done. English poetry is, so far as the mere outward form goes, the recurrence of certain combinations of accented and unaccented syllables with a verse-pulse or natural beat, called *ictus*, running through the whole.<sup>1</sup> Why should it not be so in Latin? To my mind it absolutely *is* so. I have taken a class of students and, drilling them solely upon the pronunciation of prose, with no mention made of poetry, have carried them through nearly all the forms of Latin poetry in an apparently prose passage concocted on the basis of a passage in Caesar's Gallic War. Among the verses thus inserted were some of a kind that several members who read them with complete accuracy of rhythm had never seen in actual poetry. I pronounced no word of the passage myself, but simply pointed out where, in the student's pronunciation, a long vowel or an obstructed consonant was not given with sufficient fullness, or where the student wrongly made a meaningless pause, as students are curiously prone to do, at the end of a word. It was interesting and delightful to see how the verse-pulse took care of itself. The recurrence of longs and shorts, being really observed in pronunciation, threw the reader into a frame of mind in which, all unconsciously, he felt and rendered the rhythm intended.

Here, again, my belief and practice are in opposition to established ways, and I must give my reasons.

I wrote a paper upon the subject three years ago, but, desiring to elaborate it more fully later, printed it only in the form of an abstract, in the Proceedings of the American Philological Association for 1893. What immediately follows is taken from that abstract:

The almost universal doctrine that word-accent was lost in Latin wherever it did not coincide with verse-ictus must rest upon a conviction that stress cannot fall upon two successive syllables, as in *sí vácat ác plácidi*; for, if it could, then, in the absence of evidence, we should have no reason to suppose that so essential a characteristic of a word as its accent was wholly lost.

<sup>1</sup>The element of time also enters in in modern poetry, but in moderate degree only. A more exact statement would demand a longer discussion than is in place here.

(1) My first and most important argument will be based upon certain established facts of modern speech and modern verse, the great importance of which in the study of ancient verse-systems has not been pointed out.

In modern daily speech compound words are frequent in which the word-accent falls on two successive syllables, one of which has less stress than the other, but nevertheless has more than the remaining syllables of the word. Examples are *Hinzúfügung*, *Aúsgábe*, *pénwíper*, *afchángel*, *Lóngféllow*. To these might be added a long list of compounds made by grammarians, as, for example, word-accent, verse-ictus, or, for a passing purpose, by poets, *e. g.*, birth-goddess (Matthew Arnold), tough-belted (Keats). Further, the sense-stress is often made in modern verse to fall upon a syllable that has no ictus, and frequently it is stronger than any ictus in the verse; while, on the other hand, the ictus is regularly made very light and unimportant if it falls on unimportant words, like auxiliaries, relative pronouns, prepositions, etc.

The following, from Matthew Arnold's "Fragment of an Antigone," illustrates all these phenomena:

Wéll háth hé dóne who háth seized háppiness.  
 \*       \*       \*       \*       \*       \*  
 Hé dóes wéll too who kéeps thát clúe the mild  
 Birth-góddess ánd the aústere Fâtes first gave.

What we have in these verses is a succession of stresses such as, when one is dealing with Latin poetry, is assumed to be impossible. In the first verse there is a group of four at the beginning and of three toward the end; in the second, the same; and in the third, three at the beginning and five at the end, one of the latter (in *austere*) being the result of an intentional separation of word-accent and verse-pulse. But, if this can be, how can we seriously hold that, when we come to Horace, S. 2, 2, 12, we must read:

mólliter aústerúm stúdió fallénte labórem

with only the stresses marked, instead of reading it as

mólliter aústérúm stúdió fallénte labórem?

If Matthew Arnold could say *aústere*, why in the name of all that is reasonable and intellectually endurable must we suppose that Horace was incapable of doing the corresponding thing — especially when we note, as we must do with a moment's thought, that the steady observance of longs and shorts makes the shifting of the accent easier in Latin than in English?

It would, then, seem entirely possible that the Romans may have put stress on successive syllables in verse.

(2) But the matter is not merely one of possibility. There is evidence that the Romans actually did put stress upon successive syllables. This is found in the fact that the sense-stress, which can have been given only by stronger utterance, often falls upon syllables that do not carry the verse-pulse. Examples are (for long syllables) *nón* (Iuv. 1, 30), *té* (Iuv. 10, 124); (for short

syllables) *ctbus* (Iuv. 5, 15), *Ióve* and *Ióvis* (Verg. Ecl. 3, 23). These could be multiplied to an indefinite extent.

(3) An examination of the unintentional occurrences of verse-rhythms in prose, pointed out by Roman critics, shows that in many cases the actual pronunciation of the words in an oration or a reading could not have suggested verse to the ear, if in poetry word-accent was lost wherever it did not coincide with verse-pulse. So, *e.g.*, Cicero in the Or. 66, 222, quoting Crassus's *missos faciant patronos: ipsi prodeant*, says "if he had not spoken the words *ipsi prodeant* with a pause before them, he would certainly have recognized that he had uttered a senarius; and, in any case, *prodeant ipsi* would make a better close." If, as verse, this would have the artificial rendering *missós faciánt, patronos: ipsi prodeant*, then, even if Crassus had not paused, *missos faciánt patronos: ipsi prodeant* could not have suggested to anyone a complete senarius. Compare also what Quintilian (9, 4, 74 and 76) says of Livy's *facturusne operae pretium sim* and of Cicero's *pro di immortales, qui hic inluxit dies*.

(4) The Roman grammarians furnish us with evidence, both direct and indirect, that words *retained* their ordinary accents in verse. In writing upon word-accent, they take their illustrations less frequently from prose than from verse. In many cases of the latter kind, (1) the syllable selected to illustrate the acute or the circumflex accent is one upon which the ictus does not fall; and in a number of others (2) the syllable selected to illustrate the grave accent is one upon which the ictus does fall. An example of the first is found in Priscian, Keil. III., 493, 7, where, quoting Virgil's *multa quoque et bello passus, dum conderet urbem*, Priscian explicitly asks "what accent has *quoque*?" and answers, "acute on the penult." Compare also Priscian, K. II. 302, 7 and 12; III. 33, 4; III. 33, 13; Servius, K. IV. 426, 35; Probus, K. IV. 145, 21; Sergius K. IV. 484, 9.

On the other hand, Priscian, K. III. 51, 11, says that *clam*, when used as a preposition and put before the word it governs, is pronounced with the grave accent, as in the Andria of Terence (287) *nec clam te est, quam illi utraeque nunc inutiles*. Yet the ictus falls upon this very word. Compare also Priscian, K. III. 83, 17; III. 478, 22; III. 479, 25; Probus, K. IV. 149.

(Here followed illustrative readings from Caesar, Cicero, and Virgil.)

We should bear in mind that the verse-ictus on unimportant words in modern poetry is frequently infinitesimal. Indeed, there is often, within certain limits, a complete shift of the verse-ictus, following the sense, from one part of the foot to another, as in "Eách in his nárrów céll foréver láíd." Further, we should remember that word-accent in Latin in literary times was probably less heavy than modern word-accent. Given a light word-accent, together with a verse-ictus that

may shade off into almost nothing, and the varying play of the two which I have tried to suggest becomes easy.

If my reasonings and my illustrations have persuaded you of the soundness of my belief, and of the practicability of the really quantitative reading of Latin verse, provided one reads Latin prose rightly, what ought we to do?

We shall all agree that the time spent upon this part of the work should be as little as will properly serve the purpose. That means, first, that we ought to waste no time in learning bad habits and unlearning them. What we *commit to memory* ought to be right rhythm, not wrong. It follows that, from the start, wherever a Latin word is pronounced, not only the *qualities* of the sounds should be given, but the *quantities* as well. Especially is this the case in the learning and reciting of the grammatical forms. *But the student will approximately imitate his teacher.* The critical point, then, is the teacher's own pronunciation. Secondly, the student ought to have all possible help from his editor. In other words, assistance ought to be given him through the marking of every long vowel in the greater part of the texts used in high school or preparatory studies. There is no reason in the world why the student should have to spend time in looking up quantities in the dictionary. Nor is it enough to mark the quantities in the first-year book alone; for it is evident that this practice, which has been in vogue for some time, has not been sufficient to bring about a really quantitative pronunciation.<sup>1</sup> Let me say again, what I have already implied, that there is little intellectual profit to be had from

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Sauveur, in his *Talks with Caesar de Bello Gallico*, marked the quantities of the vowels (not at first bringing much technical knowledge of the subject to bear). He desired to replace by this book the Beginner's Books, which had the quantities marked. He apparently did not, however, see the bearing of the formation of correct habits of pronunciation upon the reading of Latin verse; and his example, accordingly, did not spread. I have for many years been endeavoring, privately, to bring about a marking of the quantities in *Cæsar*, *Cicero*, and a part of *Virgil*, as will be seen by reference to the prefaces to Lowe and Ewing's *Gallie War*, first edition, Rolfe's *Nepos*, first edition, and Miller's *Aeneid*, second edition. Professor Kelsey, whom I did not at first persuade, has marked the quantities in the new edition of his *Caesar* and *Cicero*, and Professor Greenough has done the same. Professor Flagg has marked the quantities in his *Nepos*, and Messrs. Churchill and Sanford in their *Viri Romæ*. Several editions of *Cicero* with marked quantities are shortly to appear. One or two books designed for the use of Freshmen in colleges have likewise had the quantities marked for the benefit of students who have not yet formed right habits; though a change from a habit which has become a part of one's mental constitution is much more difficult than the formation of a right habit at the outset would have been.

the mere operation of acquiring a knowledge of long and short vowels. The student should get this knowledge with the least possible outlay of time. That means that certainly for three years he ought not to see a Latin word without having its full pronunciation indicated to him by the way in which it is written. In saying "for three years" I am assuming that he reads Cicero before Virgil; but whether he does or does not, the statement substantially holds good. If he reads the *Aeneid* in the third year, or even if he postpones it to the fourth year, I should mark the quantities of the vowels in several books, probably in four. If by the end of these four the student has learned, by absorption through repetition, to pronounce frequently recurring words rightly, he can then easily read the fifth and sixth books.

Before he begins the first book, however, I should suggest that, to meet the possibility of lingering faults of pronunciation, he should be assisted by an introduction, which should begin with verses in which word-accent and verse-ictus fall together throughout, and pass on gradually to more and more complicated relations. A few suitable verses (from the Epistles of Horace) may here be indicated:

*Coincidence of word-accent and verse-ictus throughout:*

Multā mōle docendus apri cō parcere prātō

*Word-accent falls away from verse-ictus once:*

Imperat aut sērvit collēcta pecūnia cuique

Nōvistine lōcum potiōrem rūre beātō

Multum dissīmilēs, at cētera paene gemelli

*Word-accent falls away from verse-ictus twice:*

Est ubi plūs tépeant hiēmēs? ubi grātior aura

Rēgēs et rēgum vitā praecurrere amicōs

Cēna brēvis iuvat et prope rīvum somnus in herba.

*Word-accent falls away from verse-ictus three times:*

Quem bībulum līquidi médiā dē lūce Falerni

*Word-accent falls away from verse-ictus four times:*

Dēterius Lībycis olet aut nītet herba lapillis

It is rarely, however, that the severance of accent and ictus occurs in the hexameter more than twice,—the same number of times as in Arnold's

Birth-goddess and the austere fates first gave.

To my ear there is a great charm in Latin verse, read with full quantities, and with observance of the abundant variation of the rela-



tion of word-accent and verse-ictus with which the Roman poet has adorned it. In the prevailing method of reading, which is substantially an accentual and non-quantitative one, I see little pleasure and little good. To my mind one of two things ought to be done. Either we ought to abandon the pronouncing of Latin entirely, dropping therewith completely the painful business of "scanning," as it is called, or else we ought to determine to pronounce the *quantities* of the Latin sounds, as well as their qualities, and thereby to make the reading of Latin verse a rational thing. I have no doubt that ultimately the second course will be taken. As a help to bringing it about, let me suggest the point of view from which it is desirable to induce the young student to look at the matter of quantities. I am told that there is on the part of many a young pupil a great dislike of the requirement of marking long vowels in the writing of Latin. He finds it a burden to remember which vowels are long and which are short. No wonder he does, inasmuch as he makes no real difference in pronunciation between the long vowel and the short vowel. What he ought to remember is not what is the length of the vowel of a given word, but *how the word sounds*, that is to say, what the word actually *is*. A foreigner who is learning English does not for example, try to remember the marks in the dictionary over the *a* in the words *cat* and *cater*, but simply carries in his mind certain sounds. So the student of Latin ought not to try to remember that the word for "soldier," for example, is made up of the letters *m, i, l, e*, and *s*, and that the *i* is long and the *e* short, but ought to remember that the word *sounds* miles. When he has occasion to write the word he writes a long *i*, and not a short one, because that is the way the word is *pronounced*; and he writes a short *e*, that is, he leaves the *e* unmarked, for the same reason—just as, if the word were Greek, he would write the sound with an *ε*, not with an *η*.

An interesting middle position has recently been suggested in a private letter written to one of the committee in charge of the Conference, namely, that we must expect our students to know the length of penults and ultimates, but that we cannot go farther without burdening them too much. This seems to me an indefensible position in point of logic, while the saving of time that would thus be effected appears to be small. Relatively speaking, the number of syllables back of the penult which would not be known to the student through the base-form which he finds in his dictionary (the nominative of the

noun, the first person singular active indicative of the verb, etc.,) is small. If a student learns to say miles, he knows, with an instant's thought, that the genitive cannot be *mīlitis*, nor the ablative plural *mīlitibus*; and he also knows that the abstract cannot be *mīlitia*, but must be *militia*. If a student learns to say *fatīgo*, *dubitō*, etc., a very little explanation on the part of his teacher at the outset will show him that he must for the participles say *fatīgātus*, not *fatīgātus*, and *dubitātūrī*, not *dubitātūrī*. And he not only then will have the satisfaction of being right in prose, but he will reap a very real good when he takes up poetry; for when, for example, he comes to Juvenal's line

*Ire fatīgātās ubi Daedalus exiit ālās*, or

*Vēre locūtūrī fātum pendēbat amīcī*, or

*Frūctus amicitiae māgnae cibus*, the verse takes care of itself. But what kind of a verse is that which begins with

*Ire fatīgātās* (— ◡ ◡ ◡ —), or

*Vēre locūtūrī* (— ◡ ◡ ◡ —), or

*Frūctus amicitiae* (— ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ —) ?

To you who have listened to me this morning the matter of my paper is one of theory, attractive or otherwise, according as it may have struck you. For me it has long since passed beyond that stage, gaining from usage in actual practice the moral support which a theory, however winning, must lack until it has had successful application. At Cornell and in Chicago I have taught many pupils who learned to read Latin prose and verse admirably. These have not abated their faith when they went elsewhere to teach. I am permitted to quote, for a case in point, from the introduction to a forthcoming publication on "The Quantitative Reading of Latin Verse," by Assistant Professor J. H. Howard, of the Indiana University: "Several years' practical application of this theory, while teaching classes in the Indiana University, has served to strengthen the writer's belief in its correctness and its absolute feasibility."

I ought not to leave the subject without pointing out that all that I have said applies equally well to Greek, excepting only that Greek accent remained for a long time a pitch-accent (probably *with* stress) while Latin accent, like Greek ictus and Latin ictus,<sup>1</sup> was a matter of

<sup>1</sup> I fail to follow Professor Bennett, who in the footnote on p. 243 of his *Latin Grammar*, says "Ictus was not accent—neither stress-accent nor musical-accent—but was simply the quantitative prominence inherent in a long syllable." I cannot easily believe that he has generalized from the dactyl alone, led by the fact that

stress only. The rule of syllabification of the Greek grammarians, echoed by the Roman grammarians, was, I believe, purely a convenient rule of thumb for dividing in writing, where some kind of a division had to be made at the end of a line. Word-accent and verse-ictus were placed by the Greek poets, I believe, in constantly shifting play. I am obliged to confess that, while I think the reading of Latin verse, with the word-accent preserved, to be easy, I fear that the Greek pitch-accent plus stress is too difficult, and that, in the common practice of schools and colleges, this doubled-natured accent must be represented by stress alone. But a correct pronunciation of *quantities* certainly might be learned. As things are now, the reading of Greek verse, like the reading of Greek prose, must remain artificial, with a different artifice for each of the two. We so train our students, as they commit to memory the forms of the Greek Grammar, that they pronounce ἴδωμαι, for example, approximately as  $\bar{\iota} \cup \cup$ , ἐνείσιν, ἔχοντες, ὄροιτο and μέμηλεν approximately as  $\acute{\iota} \cup \cup$ , παράκειται approximately as  $\cup \bar{\iota} \cup \cup$ , and the like. When, then, they come to their Homer, and find verses which any of these rhythms may end, they must perforce replace this pronunciation, which yields no rhythm, by something else, and, following English habits, they pronounce the above words approximately as  $\cup \acute{\iota} \cup$  or  $\cup \cup \acute{\iota} \cup$ , (for, singularly enough, the last syllable but one is regularly hurried in our reading of Greek and Roman hexameter.) It is only when they are asked to "prove" their "scanning," that they theoretically treat these words as having the rhythm  $\acute{\iota} - \cup$  or  $\cup \acute{\iota} - \cup$ ,—a rhythm which, in all probability, they have never heard.

the meter most familiar to our schools is the so-called dactylic hexameter, nor, on the other hand, can I believe that he finds a quantitative prominence to be inherent in the first long syllable of a spondee, and not in the second; and still less can I understand how he reconciles his theory to such facts as are represented, for one or another meters, by rhythms like as  $\acute{\iota} \cup -$ ,  $-\acute{\iota} \cup$ , and  $\cup \acute{\iota} \cup$ .